

REMARKS

Applicant will address each of the Examiner's rejections in the order in which they appear in the Office Action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC §102

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejects Claims 2, 3, 10 and 11 under 35 USC §102(e) as being anticipated by Yamaguchi et al. (US 6,222,515). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

While Applicant traverses this rejection, in order to advance the prosecution of this application, Applicant is amending independent Claims 2, 3, 10 and 11 to change “a source driver” to “a D/A converter circuit” so as to claim the features of either the supplying of voltages of picture signals from a D/A converter circuit to a pixel by scanning signals of a gate driver in a subframe period or means for supplying voltages of picture signals from a D/A converter circuit to a pixel by scanning signals of a gate driver in a subframe period. These features are supported by, for example, page 15, lns. 8-24 and Fig. 3 of the present application.

In contrast, Yamaguchi appears to disclose a “liquid crystal driving source for first field” (16) and a “liquid crystal driving source for second field” (17), and not the claimed D/A converter circuit of the present application. See e.g. col. 5, ln. 40 - col. 9, ln. 37 and Fig. 1A of Yamaguchi. Accordingly, the structure of independent Claims 10 and 11 of the present application is different than the liquid crystal display device with liquid crystal driving source of Yamaguchi, and accordingly, the method of driving a

liquid crystal display device of independent Claims 2 and 3 of the present application is different than the method disclosed in Yamaguchi.

Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that independent Claims 2, 3, 10 and 11, and those claims dependent thereon, are not disclosed or suggested by Yamaguchi and are patentable thereover. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC §103

The Examiner also rejects Claims 4-9 and 13-18 under 35 USC §103 as being unpatentable over Yamaguchi et al. in view of Katakura et al. (US 6,057,824). This rejection is also respectfully traversed.

For at least the reasons discussed above for the independent claims, these dependent claims are also not disclosed or suggested by the cited references. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

Conclusion


It is respectfully submitted that the present application is in a condition for allowance and should be allowed.

Please charge our Deposit Account No. 50-1039 for any fee due for this Amendment.

Favorable reconsideration is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: August 10, 2006


Mark J. Murphy
Registration No. 34,225

COOK, ALEX, McFARRON, MANZO,
CUMMINGS & MEHLER, LTD.
200 West Adams Street
Suite 2850
Chicago, Illinois 60606
(312) 236-8500

Customer no. 26568